

I. REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 16, 2009, the Examiner objected to claims 29 and 42 because of various informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 29-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the limitation “wherein the analytical data is converted client data” is allegedly indefinite. The Examiner further rejected claims 30-31 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the limitation “encryption/decryption utility” is allegedly indefinite. The Examiner also rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the term “reasonable level” is allegedly indefinite. The Examiner rejected claims 29-31, 33, 40-44, and 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061132 (Yu) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0120593 (Bansal). The Examiner rejected claims 32 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yu in view of Bansal and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036662 (Gauthier). The Examiner also rejected claims 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yu in view of Bansal and Gauthier and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133368 (Strutt).

II. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 29, 31, and 33-41 are currently pending. Claims 1-28 and 49-70 have been withdrawn without prejudice. Claims 30, 32, and 42-48 have been cancelled. Of the pending claims, claim 29 is independent and the remaining claims are dependent.

Independent claim 29 recites a system for client access to analytical data for use in evaluating clinical business operations,. The system comprises a database server and a server. The server, includes a system management database, which in-turn includes client authorization data. The client authorization data includes a database record associated with each authorized user that indicates which menus, views, and databases are available to the authorized user. The

database record includes a query code that specifies an initial view to be displayed to the authorized user.

The database server is operable to (i) create a temporary database for storing the client data, (ii) quantify client data, wherein the client data is quantified by analytic definitions, wherein the analytic definitions are an identification of performance measures selected from the group consisting of identifying patients needing a return visit, identifying patients with risk factors, identifying patients with similar diagnosis, identifying patients with multiple diagnosis, analyzing referrals, determining clinical experience from the different payer sources, determining adherence to quality measures, determining geographic distribution of patients, tracking patients for lack of completion of ordered laboratory tests and referrals, account receivables levels, collections, coding, front-end billing processes, and payer values (iii) create a clean database that includes the quantified data, wherein the quantified data is queried to group data according to the analytic definitions, (iv) create one or more datamarts by separating data in the clean database according to the analytic definitions, and (v) create one or more cubes by processing the datamarts using an on-line analytical processing engine, wherein the one or more cubes provide an analytical tool for evaluating clinical business operations.

The server includes an application operable to (i) receive a an authentication request from a client device, (ii) query the database server to determine whether a user of the client device is authorized, (iii) when the user is authorized, query the database server for the initial view associated with the user and transmit the initial view to the client device, (iv) receive a request from the client device for a view, select the requested view, verify that the user of the client device is authorized to access the view by querying the database server, and if the user is authorized transmit the view to the client device, wherein the view includes the analytical data

from the one or more cubes for use in evaluating clinical business operations. The amendments are fully supported by the specification. *See, e.g.*, Specification, at 17-20, 25.

III. RESPONSE TO CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Applicants thank the Examiner for identifying the informalities in pending claim 29. Applicants have amended claim 29 to address the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claim 29.

IV. RESPONSE TO § 112 REJECTIONS

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the limitation “wherein the analytical data is converted client data” is allegedly indefinite. Without conceding that the limitation was indefinite, Applicants have amended claim 29 to describe the conversion process. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the indefiniteness rejection for pending claims 29-41.

The Examiner also rejected claim 31 because the limitation “encryption/decryption utility” is allegedly indefinite. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, as noted in the specification “the encryption/decryption utility ... is used to ensure data security for *both transmitted and received data*.” Specification, at 24. Accordingly, the encryption/decryption utility is capable of both encrypting and decrypting data. As such, Applicants submit that the term is not indefinite and that the Examiner withdraw the indefiniteness rejection.

The Examiner additionally rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the term “reasonable level” is allegedly indefinite. Without conceding that the limitation was indefinite, Applicants have amended claim 34 to eliminate the “reasonable level” limitation.

V. RESPONSE TO § 103 REJECTIONS

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claim 29 as allegedly being obvious over Yu in view of Bansal. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 32 (which has been incorporated into claim 29) as being obvious over Yu in view of Bansal and Gauthier. Applicants submit that amended claim 29 is not obvious, because the combination of Yu, Bansal, and Gauthier does not reasonably lead to Applicants' invention. Specifically, the combination does not teach the claim limitation of (1) a system management database that includes client authorization data that has a database record associated with each authorized user that includes a query code that specifies an initial view to be displayed to the authorized user, or (2) a server that includes an application operable to (i) receive a an authentication request from a client device, (ii) query the database server to determine whether a user of the client device is authorized, (iii) when the user is authorized, query the database server for the initial view associated with the user and transmit the initial view to the client device.

In the office action, the Examiner acknowledges that Yu in view of Bansal does not teach this limitation. Office Action, at ¶ 23. However, the Examiner asserts that Gauthier does teach the limitation. *Id.* (*citing* Gauthier at paragraph 0062). Applicants respectfully disagree. Gauthier teaches a "web query dialog" box that integrates a web browser with Microsoft's Excel spreadsheet program. Gauthier at paragraph 0059. According to Gauthier, the web query dialog box "simplifies the task of importing objects from a web page into an application program." While a user is operating Excel, the user can open up a web query dialog box within Excel, navigate around the web page and select objects to import into the spreadsheet. *Id.* at paragraphs 0059-0061.

When the user first opens the dialog box, it opens the browser to (i) the user's home page, (ii) the browser's default page, or (iii) the page that is hard coded into Excel. *Id.* at paragraph 0062, 0071. As an initial matter, Applicants note that displaying a specific home page is not a "view" as recited by Applicants claims. Indeed, nowhere does Gauthier indicate that the home page is a database view. Moreover, Applicants submit nowhere does Gauthier indicate that there is a database record associated with authorized users. Applicants further submit that a link to a home page does not constitute "a query code that specifies an initial view to be displayed to the authorized user" as recited in Applicants' claims. *See, e.g.,* Specification, at 26-27. Finally, Applicants submit that Gauthier does not teach a server querying database server for the initial view associated with the user, as recited in Applicants claims.

If Yu, Bansal, and Gauthier were to be combined, it would not result in Applicants' claimed invention. At most, the combination would result in a web browser that would open up to a user's home page (or some other link if the user had not specified a home page), and the user could then link to some database, and login to a generic page. This is not Applicants' claimed invention. As such, because the combination of Yu, Bansal and Gauthier do not result in Applicants' invention, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the Obviousness rejection.

VI. CONCLUSION

Claim 29 is in condition for allowance. The remaining claims, 31, and 33-41 depend from claim 29 and is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3352.

Respectfully submitted,
McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: October 16, 2009

By: /Paul A. Kafadar/
Paul A. Kafadar
Registration No. 62,182